



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,744	12/28/2000	Hyung Byum Kim	13788	7201
23556	7590	09/14/2007	EXAMINER /	
KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.			ANDERSON, CATHARINE L	
Catherine E. Wolf			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
401 NORTH LAKE STREET			3761	
NEENAH, WI 54956				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/14/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Bp

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/750,744	KIM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. Lynne Anderson	3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
 Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 23-26 and 29-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 23-26 and 29-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3 July 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that Anderson fails to disclose an intake intensifier pledget located on a central portion of absorbent core, it is noted that the present claims do not define where a central portion of the absorbent core is located. The intake intensifier pledget of Anderson, shown in figure 1 as elements 2 and 3, is in contact with the absorbent core 5 along its width, and therefore located on a central portion of the core 5 as defined in the width direction of the core.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-26 and 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (5,843,063) in view of Roe et al. (6,120,783).

With respect to claims 23, and 38, Anderson discloses all aspects of the claimed invention with the exception of the cover including a hydroentangled, hydroapertured spun-lace material. Anderson discloses an absorbent article, as shown in figure 1. The article comprises a liquid pervious cover, as disclosed in column 13, lines 18-19, an absorbent core 5, and an intake intensifier pledget 2 and 3. The pledget includes a first

layer 2 comprising a through air bonded carded web, as disclosed in column 14, line 29, the web having a basis weight of between 15 and 70 gsm, as disclosed in column 14, lines 33-35, and a second layer 3 comprising an airlaid nonwoven material, as disclosed in column 20, line 7.

Anderson discloses in column 13, lines 31-40, that the liquid pervious cover comprises a nonwoven material such as a spunbond or meltblown web. Roe teaches in column 6, lines 46-67, nonwoven webs that are spunbond, meltblown, hydroentangled, hydroapertured, or a combination thereof, are equivalent for use as the liquid pervious cover of an absorbent article.

It would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make the liquid pervious cover of Anderson a hydroentangled, hydroapertured spunbond web, since Roe teaches the equivalence of such nonwoven webs for use as liquid pervious covers for absorbent articles.

With respect to claim 24, the through air bonded carded web has a low density, as disclosed in column 14, line 35, and is lofty, as disclosed in column 39-40.

With respect to claims 25, 37, and 39, the web comprises a staple fiber, as disclosed in column 14, line 24, having a denier of between 3 and 10, as disclosed in column 14, lines 31-32.

With respect to claim 26, the web comprises a bicomponent fiber, as disclosed in column 14, line 23.

With respect to claims 29 and 40, the absorbent core comprises a mixture of superabsorbent and fluff, as disclosed in column 12, lines 29-31.

With respect to claim 30, Anderson discloses all aspects of the claimed invention with the exception of the pledge having a length of at least 50 mm and a width of 30-60 mm. Anderson shows the pledge 2 has having a length that is less than the total length of the article, and width that is the width of the crotch region of the article. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make the length of the pledge at least 50 mm and the width between 30 and 60 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art (i.e. a pledge extending a portion of the length of an absorbent article), finding the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

With respect to claims 31 and 41, the article comprises a wrapping material 3, as shown in figure 1.

With respect to claim 32, the article comprises a fluid distribution layer 4, as shown in figure 1.

With respect to claim 33, a channel is formed adjacent the pledge 2, as shown in figure 1.

With respect to claims 34-35 and 42-43, the cover comprises rayon or polyester, as disclosed in column 13, lines 36-39.

With respect to claims 36 and 44, the cover comprises a mix of rayon and polyester, as disclosed in column 13, lines 36-39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the amount of rayon be 70% and the amount of polyester be 30%, since it has been held that where the general

conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, finding the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Lynne Anderson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4932. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

UMA
cla
September 11, 2007

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER

